

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-20 in the application. In a previous response and preliminary amendment, the Applicants amended Claims 1, 6, 8, 13-14 and 19. In the present response, the Applicants have not amended, canceled or added any claims. Accordingly, Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,815,016 to Erickson. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Erickson does not teach delivering a single signal to activate one of a plurality of taps to insert a corresponding delay into a PLL wherein the corresponding delay is capable of including fixed delays associated with multiple of the plurality of taps as recited in independent Claims 1, 8 and 14. Instead of a single signal able to insert a delay capable of including fixed delays associated with multiple of a plurality of taps, Erickson teaches a single signal is used to add **a single delay element** to a delay path. In other words, each delay element is added to the delay path by a single corresponding signal.

Regarding Figure 1 and the corresponding discussion, Erickson discloses a phase-locked loop having a series of selectable voltage controlled delay elements (18, 19, 20) that can be inserted into a delay path at the choice of a user. (*See* column 4, lines 40-45 and Figure 1.) The voltage controlled delay elements are connected to a series of corresponding multiplexers (21, 22, 23) that are operated by control signals applied by a corresponding control element (24, 25, 26) to select or

deselect a specific delay element or a combination of delay elements. As such, the delay elements may be introduced singly or may be cascaded. (*See* column 5, lines 4-12 and Figure 1.)

Thus, instead of delivering a single signal to activate one tap to insert a corresponding delay into a PLL wherein the corresponding delay is capable of including fixed delays associated with multiple of the plurality of taps, Erickson discloses inserting each individual delay element into the delay path by a separate, corresponding control element. (*See* column 5, lines 4-12; column 7, lines 26-39; and Figure 1.) For example, delay element 20 is inserted into the delay path by control element 26 and delay element 19 is inserted by control element 25. Thus, in Erickson, a single signal, such as from one of the control elements (24, 25, 26), does not insert a delay in the delay path wherein the delay is capable of including multiple of the delay elements (18, 19, 20). (*See* Figure 1.)

On the contrary, to add multiple delay elements to the delay path, Erickson requires a signal for each delay element. As such, Erickson fails to teach delivering a single signal to activate one of a plurality of taps to insert a corresponding delay capable of including fixed delays associated with multiple of the plurality of taps as recited in independent Claims 1, 8 and 14.

Therefore, Erickson does not disclose each and every element of independent Claim 1, 8 and 14 and Claims dependent thereon. As such, Erickson does not anticipate independent Claims 1-20. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §102 rejection with respect to Claims 1-20 and allow issuance thereof.

II. Comment on “Response to Arguments”

The Applicants disagree with the Examiner's understanding of independent Claims 1, 8 and 14. The Examiner asserts that these claims require a single signal to activate one of a plurality of

taps and that this implies "another signal to activate another of a plurality of taps." Additionally, the Examiner asserts that the features upon which the Applicants rely are not recited in the pending claims. (See Examiner's Final Rejection, page 2.)

Independent Claims 1, 8 and 14, however, include a single signal is delivered to activate one of a plurality of taps to insert a corresponding delay wherein the corresponding delay is capable of including fixed delays associated with multiple of the plurality of taps. Thus, instead of implying another signal is needed to activate another one of a plurality of taps, Claims 1, 8 and 14 clearly indicate a single signal can activate multiple of the plurality of taps. Accordingly, based on the pending claim language, an additional signal is not required to activate another of the plurality of taps.


III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-20.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC



I Joel Justiss
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: August 23, 2006

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800